



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,699	01/14/2000	Scott A. Deyoc	DP-302096	8714
7590 01/15/2004				
Jimmy L. Funke Delphi Delco Legal Staff Mail Code A107 P.O. Box 9005 Kokomo, IN 46904		EXAMINER ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A		
		ART UNIT 2654		PAPER NUMBER
		DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004		16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/483,699

Applicant(s)

DEYOE ET AL

Examiner

Angela A. Armstrong

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,10-23,25-40 and 42-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,8,10-20,23,25-37,40 and 42-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,21,22,38 and 39 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-14, 16-20 and 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surace et al (US Patent No. 6,144,938) in view of Polikaitis et al (US Patent No. 6,336,091), and further in view of Nguyen (US Patent No. 5,765,130).
3. Regarding claims 1-5, 8-14, 16-20 and 23-31, Surace et al teach
memory for storing information at col. 3, lines 41-42
a processor coupled to the memory at Figure 1, element 105; col. 3, line 42
receiving voice input from the user via microphone at col. 3, lines 55-58
providing voice feedback to the user via speaker at col. 3, lines 55-58
detecting whether the user has provided voice input at col. 7, lines 49-51
determining whether a voice input is associated with a specific user at col. 22, lines 52-54
determining whether the voice input provided by the user is recognized by the speech
recognition system at col. 23, lines 34-43
performing a speech selectable task when the voice input provided by the user is
recognized by the speech recognition system at col. 23, lines 43-45; col. 24, lines 1-5
tracking the users interaction with system at col. 14, lines 52-57

Art Unit: 2654

voice feedback provided to the user is level dependent and provides available commands for a current level at the Abstract and col. 10, lines 21 continuing to col. 11, line 25

Surace et al do not specifically teach providing adaptive voice feedback to the user when the user has not provided a voice input for a predetermined user specific time period. Refer to Polikaitis et al who discloses a system for screening speech recognition input which implements alerting or providing feedback to the user if the voice input provided by the user during a recognition window contains errors (col. 2, lines 46-48), such as a user not saying anything during the recognition window (col. 1, lines 44-51)

an adjustable recognition window (col. 9, lines 35-52)
deactivating the speech recognition system when the voice input from the user is not recognized by the speech recognition system (col. 2, lines 48-50)

activating the speech recognition system (col. 5, lines 48-50)

activating the speech recognition system via a switch (col. 5, lines 51-52)

activating the speech recognition system via voice (col. 5, lines 51-53)

Polikaitis et al teach that the system is advantageous for providing feedback instructing a user how to improve the speech input for optimizing the speech recognition system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the speech recognition user interface of Surace et al to implement providing voice feedback to the user when the user has not provided a voice input during a recognition window and deactivating the speech recognition system when the voice input from the user is not recognized by the speech recognition system as taught by Polikaitis et al, for the purpose of

Art Unit: 2654

providing feedback instructing a user how to improve the speech input for optimizing the speech recognition system, as suggested by Polikaitis et al.

Surace and Polikaitis do not teach a user specific time period. Refer to Nguyen who teaches a method and apparatus for facilitating speech barge-in in connection with voice recognition systems. Specifically, Nguyen teaches implementing barge-in capabilities in a voice-response system such that frequent users of a system would not need to wait for a completed prompt for the system before being allowed to respond.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to implement a user specific response time period as suggested by Nguyen, in the voice user interface system of Surace, for the purpose of allowing experienced users the capabilities of entering requests or information without waiting for a complete set of instructions.

4. Claims 15, 32-37, and 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Surace et al (US Patent No. 6,144,938) in view of Polikaitis et al (US Patent No. 6,336,091) and Nguyen (US Patent No. 5,765,130) and further in view of Everhart et al (US Patent No. 6,240,347).

5. Regarding claims 15, 32-37, and 40-48 Surace et al teach
memory for storing information at col. 3, lines 41-42
a processor coupled to the memory at Figure 1, element 105; col. 3, line 42
receiving voice input from the user via microphone at col. 3, lines 55-58
providing voice feedback to the user via speaker at col. 3, lines 55-58

Art Unit: 2654

detecting whether the user has provided voice input at col. 7, lines 49-51

determining whether a voice input is associated with a specific user at col. 22, lines 52-54

determining whether the voice input provided by the user is recognized by the speech recognition system at col. 23, lines 34-43

performing a speech selectable task when the voice input provided by the user is recognized by the speech recognition system at col. 23, lines 43-45; col. 24, lines 1-5

tracking the users interaction with system at col. 14, lines 52-57

voice feedback provided to the user is level dependent at col. 10, lines 21-46

Surace et al do not specifically teach providing adaptive voice feedback to the user when the user has not provided a voice input for a predetermined user specific time period. Refer to Polikaitis et al who discloses a system for screening speech recognition input which implements

alerting or providing feedback to the user if the voice input provided by the user during a recognition window contains errors (col. 2, lines 46-48), such as a user not saying anything during the recognition window (col. 1, lines 44-51)

a user specified or manufacturer specified recognition window (col. 9, lines 35-52)

deactivating the speech recognition system when the voice input from the user is not recognized by the speech recognition system (col. 2, lines 48-50)

activating the speech recognition system (col. 5, lines 48-50)

activating the speech recognition system via a switch (col. 5, lines 51-52)

activating the speech recognition system via voice (col. 5, lines 51-53)

Polikaitis et al teach that the system is advantageous for providing feedback instructing a user how to improve the speech input for optimizing the speech recognition system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the speech recognition user interface of Surace et al to implement providing voice feedback to the user when the user has not provided a voice input during a recognition window and deactivating the speech recognition system when the voice input from the user is not recognized by the speech recognition system as taught by Polikaitis et al, for the purpose of providing feedback instructing a user how to improve the speech input for optimizing the speech recognition system, as suggested by Polikaitis et al.

Surace and Polikaitis do not teach a user specific time period. Refer to Nguyen who teaches a method and apparatus for facilitating speech barge-in in connection with voice recognition systems. Specifically, Nguyen teaches implementing barge-in capabilities in a voice-response system such that frequent users of a system would not need to wait for a completed prompt for the system before being allowed to respond.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to implement a user specific response time period as suggested by Nguyen, in the voice user interface system of Surace, for the purpose of allowing experienced users the capabilities of entering requests or information without waiting for a complete set of instructions

Surace do not specifically teach that the speech selectable task is performed by a motor vehicle accessory. Refer to Everhart et al who teach a user interface for a voice control system for controlling a plurality of adjustable parameters of vehicle accessories (abstract). Everhart teaches that voice control systems are advantageous because it allows a driver to take advantage of the accessories of the vehicle without interfering with the task of driving (col. 1, lines 11-25).

Art Unit: 2654

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the system of Surace and Polikaitis et al to allow for implementation of the speech recognition user interface in a motor vehicle accessory system, as taught by Everhart et al, so as to provide feedback instructing a user how to improve the speech input for optimizing the speech recognition system, as taught by Polikaitis et al, thus ensuring that the user is able to take advantage of the accessories of the vehicle without interfering with the task of driving, as suggested by Everhart et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 6-7, 21-22, and 38-39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable over the cited prior art if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed October 29, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. Applicant argues Surace does not associate a voice input with a specific user. The Examiner disagrees and argues Surace teaches a user provides voice input to interact with the voice interface and specifically teaches that the subscriber must successfully log on to the system via a logon and password state, which reads on associating a voice input with a specific user, since the subscriber ("specific user") must provide the logon and password via voice ("voice

Art Unit: 2654

input') and successful logon requires the validation of the logon and password for that subscriber ("associating a voice input with a specific user").

Applicant argues Surace does not disclose a system and/or method that provides adaptive voice feedback when a specific user has not provided voice input for a predetermined user specific time period. Applicant argues Surace does not disclose using a user specific time period to determine when to provide adaptive voice feedback to a specific user associated with the user specific time period. Applicant argues Polikaitis does not in combination with Surace teach or suggest Applicant's claimed subject matter. Applicant argues the teachings of Polikaitis of deactivating or halting speech recognition processing so that a user may correct an error in a speech recognition format is not the same as "deactivating a speech recognition driven system when a user has failed to respond to a user specific set number of predetermined user specific time periods at a given level." Applicant argues Nguyen does not disclose using a user specific time period to determine when to provide adaptive voice feedback to a specific user associated with the user specific time period. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this instance, the claimed subject matter was rejected based on a combination of Surace, Polikaitis and Nguyen or the combination of Surace, Polikaitis, Nguyen, and Everhart.

Regarding claims 1, 16, and 33, Applicant argues that Applicant cannot find any teaching or suggestion in Surace and/or Polikaitis and/or Nguyen (and/or Everhart), which is directed to determining whether voice input is associated with a specific user. The Examiner disagrees and

Art Unit: 2654

argues Surace teaches a user provides voice input to interact with the voice interface and specifically teaches that the subscriber must successfully log on to the system via a logon and password state, which reads on associating a voice input with a specific user, since the subscriber (“specific user”) must provide the logon and password via voice (“voice input”) and successful logon requires the validation of the logon and password for that subscriber (“associating a voice input with a specific user”).

Applicant argues that Applicant cannot find any teaching or suggestion in Surace and/or Polikaitis and/or Nguyen (and/or Everhart), which is directed to using a user specific time period to determine when to provide adaptive voice feedback to a specific user associated with the user specific time period. The Examiner disagrees and argues Polikaitis teaches alerting or providing feedback to the user if during an adjustable recognition a user does not say anything and Nguyen teaches the importance of flexible response time periods for users of varying system familiarity, which reads on a user specific time period.

Applicant argues that Applicant cannot find any teaching or suggestion in Surace and/or Polikaitis and/or Nguyen (and/or Everhart), which is directed to providing adaptive voice feedback that is level dependent and that provides available commands for a current level. The Examiner disagrees and argues Surace provides support for voice feedback being provided to the user that is level dependent and that provides available commands for a current level at col. 10, lines 51-63, since the context-sensitive help that is provided includes informing the user of the available options, or an explanation of what the user can currently instruct the system to do at the current stage of the operation.

Regarding claims 2, 17, and 34, Applicant argues that Applicant cannot find any teaching or suggestion in Surace and/or Polikaitis and/or Nguyen (and/or Everhart), which is directed to tracking the number of times in which a user has failed to respond for a predetermined user specific time period at a given level and deactivating a speech recognition driven system when a user has failed to respond for a user specific set number of the predetermined user specific time periods at the given level. Additionally, Applicant argues that the combination of Polikaitis, Surace and Nguyen (and Everhart) does not teach or suggest the system, and that any assertion to the contrary must be based on impermissible hindsight based on Applicant's disclosure. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Additionally, the Examiner argues Surace provides support for tracking the users interaction with the system and voice feedback being provided to the user that is level dependent and that provides available commands for a current level at col. 10, lines 51-63, since the context-sensitive help that is provided includes informing the user of the available options, or an explanation of what the user can currently instruct the system to do at the current stage of the operation. Additionally, Polikaitis teaches alerting or providing feedback to the user if during an adjustable recognition a user does not say anything and Nguyen teaches the

Art Unit: 2654

importance of flexible response time periods for users of varying system familiarity, which reads on a user specific time period.

Regarding claims 5, 20, and 37, Applicant argues cannot find any teaching or suggestion in Surace and/or Polikaitis and/or Nguyen (and/or Everhart), which is directed to a speech recognition driven system that adjusts a predetermined user specific time period, or a user specific set number of predetermined user specific time periods as the ability of the specific user changes. The Examiner disagrees and argues Polikaitis teaches alerting or providing feedback to the user if during an adjustable recognition a user does not say anything and Nguyen teaches the importance of flexible response time periods for users of varying system familiarity, which reads on a user specific time period.

Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2654

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 703-308-6258.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (703) 305-9645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Angela A. Armstrong
Examiner
Art Unit 2654



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AAA
January 8, 2004